

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Little Snake Field Office
455 Emerson Street
Craig, CO 81625

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2012-0039-DNA

PESTICIDE USE PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12-CO-100-96

PROJECT NAME: Herbicide application for control of noxious weeds and bareground vegetation treatments at well sites and associated access roads.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Multiple sites within the Little Snake Field Office. See attached list and maps.

APPLICANT: Pride Weed Control for Wexpro Company

A. Describe the Proposed Action

Herbicide applications would be made to control vegetation on oil and gas well locations, production, treatment and transmission facilities, pipeline rights-of-way and access roads. These sites have been previously leveled, graded and disturbed. Treating noxious weeds on these sites would aid in controlling further weed infestations and establishing perennial vegetation. Bare ground herbicide application would aid in fire prevention, operation and maintenance of facilities. Herbicide would be applied by truck, tractor or ATV with handguns and mounted booms. Some applications would be by backpack sprayer as well. In addition to the herbicides two surfactants (Activator 90 and MSO) and dye (High-Light) would be applied to improve action of herbicide and visibility of application. The PUP (#12-CO-100-96) describes further details associated with the proposed action.

Noxious and Invasive Weed Control

The proposed action includes application of herbicides for noxious weed control dependent upon the species present at the site. Multiple herbicides could be included within the tank mix in accordance with the product label and would be applied at sites to control noxious and invasive weeds. Approximately 2-4 acres per site would be treated.

Trade Name	Common Name	Application Rate (Formulated Product)	Application Rate (Chemical)
Rifle	dicamba	1-2 pts/ac	0.5-1 lb a.e./ac/yr
Redeem R&P	triclopyr	1-4 pts/ac	0.28-1.12 lbs a.e./ac/yr
	clopyralid		0.09-0.375 lbs a.e./ac/yr
Cruise Control	dicamba	1-2 pts/ac	0.5-1 lb a.e./ac/yr
Prescott Herbicide	triclopyr	1-4 pts/ac	0.28-1.12 lb/ac/yr
	clopyralid		0.09-0.375 lbs/ac/yr
MSM 60	metsulfuron methyl	1 oz/ac	0.0375 lb a.i./ac/yr
2,4-D Low Vol 6	2,4-D ester	2 2/3 pt/ac	1.87lb/ac/yr
Escort XP	metsulfuron methyl	1 oz/ac	0.0375 lb a.i./ac/yr
Telar XP	chlorsulfuron	0.25 to 1 oz/ac	0.0117-0.0469 lb a.i./ac/yr
Weedmaster	dicamba	0.25-0.5 gal/ac	0.25-0.5 lb a.i./ac/yr
	2,4-D		0.72-1.435 lb a.e./ac/yr

Bare Ground Treatment

The herbicides listed below would be applied at sites to provide total vegetation control around equipment and facilities. Approximately 0.5 acres would receive bareground treatment at each site.

Trade Name	Common Name	Application Rate (Formulated Product)	Application Rate (Chemical)
Round-Up Pro	Glyphosate	2 qts/ac	1.5 lb a.e./ac/yr
Glyphosate 4 Plus	Glyphosate	1 gal/ac	3 lb a.e./ac/yr
Mojave	Imazapyr	10-12 lbs/ac	0.78-0.93 lbs/ac/yr
	Diuron		6.22-7.47 lbs/ac/yr
Sahara	Imazapyr	10-12 lbs/ac	0.78-0.93 lbs/ac/yr
	Diuron		6.22-7.47 lbs/ac/yr

Application of all herbicides would conform to the stipulations in Attachment #1.

Applicants will be responsible for all required certifications and permits necessary to apply herbicides in the State of Colorado.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Little Snake Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (RMP)

Date Approved: October, 2011

Final RMP/EIS, August, 2010

Draft RMP/EIS, January, 2007

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The Proposed Action implements Vegetation Goals and Objectives on page RMP-16 of the RMP to reduce the occurrence of noxious weeds and undesirable plant species by ensuring that all land use actions that could potentially increase the occurrence of noxious weeds are conducted by using BMPs and applying principles of integrated pest management. Additionally, Weed management will be integrated across landscape and ownership boundaries by pursuing whenever possible, the use of cooperative agreements to coordinate weed management actions and identify ways of partnering with resource users and other stakeholders to reduce the occurrence of noxious weeds. The proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1601.03). The proposed action of approval of a Pesticide Use Proposal is in conformance with the Little Snake Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan.

Other Documents:

Colorado Public Land Health Standards and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing
Date Approved: February 12, 1997

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as Amended (43 USC 1752)

Rangeland Reform Final Environmental Impact Statement, December 1994.

The proposed action also conforms with county use plans.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) (June, 2007).

DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2009-0025-EA, Little Snake Field Office Integrated Pest Management Plan resulted in a Finding of No Significant Impact. This Environmental Assessment considered the options of Integrated Pest Management as outlined in the FEIS and adopted the standard operation procedures for vegetation treatment program implementation in the LSFO.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Yes. There are no changes from the proposed action analyzed in DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2009-0025-EA, congruent with pesticide use proposal stipulations (see Attachment #1). The Pesticide

Use Proposals that are reviewed and approved based on the existing NEPA documents complete the site-specific analysis for these herbicide applications.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes. The density of some invasive noxious and undesirable plant species has been reduced in some areas, and although, noxious and undesirable weeds have been identified in new locations, there have been no changes in environmental concerns, interests or resource values since DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2009-0025-EA.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

Yes. The Proposed Action would have no disproportionate impacts on minority populations or low income communities per Executive Order (EO) 12898 and would not adversely impact migratory birds per EO 13186.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes. The methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action. Impacts to all resources were analyzed.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes. Direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action are unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents. The Pesticide Use Proposals that are reviewed and approved based on the existing NEPA documents complete the site-specific analysis for these herbicide applications.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes. The cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed action would remain unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes. Public outreach through scoping and involvement of the public and other agencies occurred in the development of the RMP/EIS and DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2009-0025-EA.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Title	Resource	Date
Ecologist	Air Quality, Floodplains Prime/Unique Farmlands, Water Quality – Surface, Wetlands/Riparian Zones	5/1/12

Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Native American Concerns	5/7/12
Realty Specialist	Environmental Justice	4/30/12
Environmental Coord. NEPA	Hazardous Materials	5/4/12
Rangeland Management Spec.	Invasive Non-native Species	5/4/12
Rangeland Management Spec.	Sensitive Plants, T&E Plant	5/1/12
Wildlife Biologist	T&E Animal	5/1/12
Geologist	Water Quality - Ground	5/7/12
Recreation Specialist	WSA, W&S Rivers	5/8/12
Wildlife Biologist	Animal Communities	5/1/12
Wildlife Biologist	Special Status, T&E Animal	5/1/12
Rangeland Management Spec	Plant Communities	5/4/12
Rangeland Management Spec	Special Status, T&E Plant	5/1/12
Ecologist	Riparian Systems	5/1/12
Ecologist	Water Quality	5/1/12
Ecologist	Upland Soils	5/1/12

Land Health Assessment

This action has been reviewed for conformance with the BLM’s Public Land Health Standards adopted February 12, 1997. This action meets Public Land Health Standards. Land health assessments have been conducted in landscapes and watersheds within the Field Office Planning Area. Invasive plants, especially annuals weeds have been found to be a problem on many sites and once established are a threat to the herbaceous component of the ecosystems.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Signature of Lead Specialist _____ Date _____

Signature of NEPA Coordinator _____ Date _____

Signature of the Authorizing Official _____ Date _____

Note: The signed Conclusion on this document is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

Attachment #1

DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2012-0039 DNA

BLM LSFO PUP Stipulations

General Stipulations:

- All herbicide treatments on BLM administered lands will comply with applicable federal and state statutory and regulatory requirements.
 - Manufacturers label directions and guidelines, including but not limited to, application rates, uses, handling instructions, storage and disposal requirements, will be followed
 - All BLM procedures (BLM Handbook H-9011-1 Chemical Pest Control) and Manuals 1112 Safety, 9011 Chemical Pest Control, and 9015 Integrated Weed Management, and any other BLM requirements will be followed. Where more restrictive, BLMs requirements for rates, uses, and handling instructions will apply.
 - Only certified applicators, or those directly supervised by a certified applicator, may apply herbicide on BLM administered public lands.
-

To ensure that risks to human health and the environment from herbicide treatments are kept to a minimum, and that all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been adopted, the following will apply:

- All herbicide treatments will be consistent with the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) presented in the ROD of the 2007 Final *Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* (PEIS).
 - Measures to mitigate potential adverse environmental effects as a result of herbicide treatments as found in the ROD of the PEIS.
 - All conservation measures, designed to protect plants and animals listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, as found in the Biological Assessment of the PEIS.
-

Cultural Resources Discovery

The applicator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are encountered or uncovered during any project activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate vicinity of the find and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO) at (970) 826-5000.

Within five working days, the AO will inform the operator as to:

- Whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
- The mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the identified area can be used for project activities again; and
- Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) (Federal Register Notice, Monday, December 4, 1995, Vol. 60, No. 232) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone at (970) 826-5000, and with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

SOURCE:

DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2009-0025-EA